UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/388,899	09/02/1999	BEREND HOUWEN	10690/T/B/A	4619

7590 12/02/2002

LEO G LENNA
BRYAN CAVE LLP
245 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10167

EXAMINER	
GABEL, GAILENE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1641	15

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/388,899	HOUWEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gailene R. Gabel	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 August 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment Entry

1. Applicant's amendment and response filed 8/29/02 in Paper No. 14 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 1, 2, and 12-14 have been amended. Currently, claims 1-14 are pending and are under examination.

Rejections Withdrawn

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

2. In light of Applicant's amendment and arguments, the rejection of claims 1-10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bowen et al. (Laboratory Hematology, 1997) is hereby, withdrawn.

3. In light of Applicant's amendment and arguments, the rejection of claims 1-10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Loken et al. (EP 0317516) is hereby, withdrawn.

4. In light of Applicant's amendment and arguments, the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen et al. (Laboratory Hematology, 1997) in view of McCarthy et al. (Journal of Immunological Methods, 1993) is hereby, withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, step 5), line 2 after "step 4), "intro" should be --into--.

Claim 1, step 5) is redundant in reciting, "classifying the neutrophilic cells obtained in step 4) into groups having different degrees of maturity into groups of neutrophilic cells different in degree of maturity on the basis ...". Perhaps Applicant intends "classifying the neutrophilic cells obtained in step 4) into groups having different degrees of maturity on the basis ...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen et al. (Laboratory Hematology, 1997) in view of Gopinath et al. (Cytometry, 1997).

Bowen et al. teach patterns of expression of CD16 and CD11b antigens by cells in bone marrow of patients using flow cytometric monoclonal antibody-based, three color immunofluorescence technique which permits simultaneous characterization of different cell populations (see Abstract). In flow cytometric analysis studies, Bowen et al. teach aspirating a hematological sample (bone marrow) into blood collection tubes, staining the cells using a combination of three different monoclonal antibodies, then lysing erythrocytes using Ortho Lyse. Specifically, Bowen et al. teach staining the sample with the combination of fluorescent labeled antibodies including 1) fluorescence-labeled CD45 antibody (first antibody), fluorescence isothiocyanate (FITC)-labeled CD16 antibody (second antibody), and phycoerythrin (PE)-labeled CD11b antibody (third antibody). Five parameters were measured flow cytometrically which include side angle scatter (SALS), forward angle scatter (FALS), Tri-color fluorescence intensity, FITC intensity, and PE intensity. In data analysis, a gate was set to classify immature (developing) and mature fluorescence labeled granulocytes which have high side angle scatter, thus, excluding other leucocytes that are not granulocytes (blasts, monocytes, and lymphocytes) which have lower side angle scatter. From the granulocyte gate, events were also quantified in fluorescence intensity measurements of the cells labeled

with FITC-labeled CD16 antibody and PE-labeled CD11b antibody (see page 294, column 1). Bowen also confirmed that peripheral blood neutrophil populations within varying maturation levels (promyelocytes, myelocytes, metamyelocytes, and band cells) are quantified within the CD11b and CD16 regions because both CD16 and CD11b normally increase during the maturation of granulocytes from promyelocytic stage to segmented neutrophil stage (see page 294, column 2 and page 275, column 1). Bowen further observed that the manual percentage of band to segmented neutrophils correlated well with CD16 expression suggesting that in the course of granulocyte maturation, CD11b expression appears earlier and prior to the expression of CD16; therefore, anti-CD16 antibodies are more useful in defining granulocytes in later maturation stages than CD11b (see page 296, column 2). In conclusion, Bowen teach that simultaneous quantitation of SALS and fluorescent labeled monoclonal antibody binding to CD45, CD16, and CD11b define highly reproducible developmental maturation patterns of the granulocytic cell population series in flow cytometry.

Bowen et al. differ from the instant invention in failing to teach distinguishing eosinophils and neutrophilic cells in the granulocytic cells measured in step 3) of claim 1 which were obtained on the basis of scattered light signal and fluorescence intensity of the granulocytic cells. Bowen et al. also differ from the instant invention in failing to teach staining leucocytes after the erythrocytes are removed from the hematological sample.

Gopinath et al. teach identification of eosinophils in lysed whole blood samples utilizing their high side angle scatter and CD16 fluorescence intensity negativity (see

Abstract). According to Gopinath, use of lysed whole blood in flow cytometry allows the study of cell surface markers (CD45, CD16, and CD11b) on cell populations such as granulocytes, lymphocytes, and monocytes without using cell purification techniques that may affect expression of these markers. In study, Gopinath et al. teach using PE labeled anti-CD16 to distinguish neutrophils from eosinophils. CD16 is expressed uniformly in immature to mature neutrophilic stages (metamyelocyte, band, and segmented neutrophils); by contrast, eosinophils are CD16 negative. Additionally, eosinophils display a high side angle scatter in comparison to neutrophils (see page 313, columns 1-2). Specifically, Gopinath et al. teach that the most accurate isolation of eosinophils from neutrophils is obtained by a combination of side angle scatter and anti-CD16 PE fluorescence intensity (see page 314, column 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to incorporate the teaching of Gopinath in distinguishing between neutrophils and eosinophil populations, with the flow cytometric method of Bowen because Gopinath specifically taught that a combination of side angle scatter and CD16 fluorescence intensity measurement provides for an accurate isolation of eosinophils from neutrophils in the granulocytic populations taught in the method of Bowen and Bowen further taught that CD11b expression appears earlier and prior to the expression of CD16; therefore, CD11b is more useful in defining granulocytes in early maturation stages than CD16. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teaching of Gopinath in lysing hematological samples prior to performing the flow cytometric method taught by Bowen

which assesses expression of cell surface markers such as CD45, CD16, and CD11b because Gopinath specifically taught that use of lysed hematological samples, i.e. whole blood, in flow cytometry allows the study of cell surface markers on cell populations of granulocytes, lymphocytes, and monocytes without using cell purification techniques that may affect expression of these markers.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

8. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gailene R. Gabel whose telephone number is (703) 305-0807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday, 6:30 AM - 4:00 PM and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (703) 308-3399. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Gailene R. Gabel
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641

11/25/02

CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ~~1800~~ 1641